



Criterion A: (4) The presentation was structured so as to state the KI (though they called it a topic) clearly: How do we embrace cultural differences after living in a diverse community of many cultural backgrounds? They explained well how it arose from a real-life situation of obvious interest and importance to the students involved. The KI could have been more generalized to explore the implications of their discussion on cultural difference in general.

Criterion B: (5) Three elements show their high achievement on this criterion. First, they analysed well a number of key TOK concepts (knowledge, culture, paradigm, reason, emotion, language) in relation to their situation. Second, they showed the interaction between these elements, demonstrating their grasp of the complexity of both the situation and the TOK analysis of it. Finally, they continually linked their more abstract points to the situation through a series of well-chosen personal examples and counter-examples.

Criterion C: (5) It quite a number of ways—in the choice of examples and

counter-examples from their own experience; their obvious enthusiasm; their ability to speak fluently at times without notes; their ability to construct personal accounts and arguments (occasionally quite striking)—the students demonstrated their personal knowers' perspectives on the topic.

Criterion D: (5) The students introduced a number of different ways of contrasting perspectives: from their own cultural backgrounds (and those of others); through different WOK lenses; from different lengths of time in the boarding house; among others. They also demonstrated the ability to draw together these perspectives and consider a number of the interesting ways in which they interact (for example cultural background and personal attributes; reason and emotion, language and emotion).

Overall ...

This group presentation clearly arose from a matter of great personal import to all the students involved. The structure is excellent, in introducing a real-life

situation, drawing a clear KI from it and using TOK concepts to analyse it in depth. It is interesting that they did not always explicitly identify the TOK points they were making (for example, at 13.20, they did not state that they were giving an example of the interaction between knower-based upbringing and cultural background, the sense perception-related circumstances one is in, and the WOK emotional reactions one has). Signposting such connections can be a way of drawing your knowledge to the attention of your teacher, but doing it too much can make your presentation sound piecemeal. A sophisticated analysis that has just enough, but not too much, signposting shows a well-embedded understanding of TOK. Overall, this is a good example of a presentation that, by tackling a matter within their own and their audience's experience, did not get bogged down in researching and conveying a lot of information. Despite the local emphasis, the issues covered are of huge importance in the world—and this could have been explored a little more, if their KI had been stated more generally.

Examiner report

Criterion A: (3) Although the presentation, overall, addresses several strong KIs, it could have led into, and identified, them much more explicitly. It starts with a general topic (honour killings) rather than a particular real-life situation: choosing an account of a specific honour killing would have enabled the presenter to set up the KIs clearly.

Criterion B: (5) The presentation shows considerable insight into the complexity of the topic, analysing the relevance, and interaction, of a number of AOKs (human science, natural science, ethics) and all four WOKs. There is also a fine sensitivity to the effects of the attributes of knowers on their beliefs.

Criterion C: (5) The presenter on a number of occasions expresses thoughtful,

reflective insights into the material she is considering. She is well aware of complexity, yet makes a strong case for action.

Criterion D: (4) The presentation shows a fine appreciation of the complexity of the issue, considers the views of different knowers, and looks at several (implicit) KIs through many AOKs and WOKs, though too often without using TOK terms explicitly when doing this.

Overall ...

This presentation's major flaws are structural. First, the presenter ought to have started with a specific real-life situation involving an honour killing, and then proceeded explicitly to draw out the KI: there is insufficient focus at

the start. Second, the discussion could have brought the relevance to TOK more to the surface by using TOK terms more often. As your presentation is part of the TOK course for your audience, you should ensure that you make the TOK relevance clear at all times. If these flaws are reset aside, then the presentation is insightful, with the presenter exhibiting a very strong ability to dig deeply into the issue, and to understand its complexity. Perhaps its strongest feature is her ability to represent the views of those with whom she does not agree, yet to argue strongly for her own conclusion. With more attention to the technical requirements of a TOK presentation, this could have gained a score of 20/20.

thin this presentation, the students
irt from the real-life situation of four
ferent "national views" drawn from
eir research into the attitudes and
liefs of students in their boarding
use. This leads to their KI, after which
ey explore how the TOK considerations
aid their colleagues and themselves
avoiding a stereotyped reaction to
ers.


Living in an international boarding house: How do we accommodate
difference across cultural backgrounds?

[Presentation 8, taken from 2008]


This presentation achieved 19/20, a grade A

Time Comment

The students...

0.15  explicitly tell us their KI (though they call it a topic) and then link it to the real-life situation.
Clearly identify the real-life situation and the central KI early.

Time Comment

0.20  choose a KI that is perhaps a little too tied to the real-life situation. It could investigate understanding across cultural difference in general.

A good KI looks beyond the specifics of the real-life situation from which it arises.